

Hampshire Minerals and Waste Development Framework

**Hampshire
Minerals and Waste Core Strategy
Adoption Statement**

July 2007

Contents

1	Introduction and purpose	3
2	Adoption Statement	4
3	Analysis of schedules of changes	5
4	Integration of sustainability into the Core Strategy	12
5	Consultation outcomes	14
6	Conclusions	16

1 Introduction and purpose

- 1.1** Regulation 35 of the Town and County Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 requires the drafting and publication of an adoption statement. Regulation 24 states that an Adoption Statement means a statement:
- of the date on which a DPD is adopted;
 - that a person aggrieved by the DPD may make an application to the High Court under section 113 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004;
 - of the grounds which, and the time within which, such an application may be made;
 - that any such application must be made promptly and in any event not later than 3 months after the date on which the statement was adopted.
- 1.2** The formal requirements of the Adoption Statement are included in chapter 2.
- 1.3** The Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) - now Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) - guidance, 'Sustainability Appraisal of Regional Spatial Strategies and Local Development Documents' (November, 2005) states that local planning authorities must produce an adoption statement to accompany an adopted Development Plan Document (DPD) outlining how they have taken the findings of the full Sustainability Appraisal process into account, and how sustainability considerations more generally have been integrated into the DPD. If any significant changes are made to the Core Strategy as a result of the Public Examination, these may also need to be re-appraised and the results documented within the adoption statement.
- 1.4** This document fulfils these requirements as they relate to the Hampshire, Portsmouth, Southampton and New Forest National Park Minerals and Waste Core Strategy DPD (the Core Strategy) by covering the following points:
- Analysis of the need for re-appraisal of any changes, recommended as a result of the independent Public Examination;
 - Demonstration of the integration of Sustainability Appraisal findings and sustainability considerations into the Strategy.
- 1.5** These requirements are addressed in chapters 3 to 6.

2 Adoption Statement

PLANNING AND COMPULSORY PURCHASE ACT 2004

The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004

Hampshire Minerals and Waste Development Framework

Hampshire Minerals and Waste Core Strategy

Adoption Statement

21 September 2007

In accordance with Regulation 36 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004, notice is hereby given that Hampshire County Council, Portsmouth City Council, Southampton City Council and the New Forest National Park Authority adopted the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Core Strategy – part of the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Development Framework – on the following dates:

28 June 2007 New Forest National Park Authority

12 July 2007 Hampshire County Council

17 July 2007 Portsmouth City Council

18 July 2007 Southampton City Council

Any person aggrieved by the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Core Strategy may make an application to the High Court under Section 113 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 on the grounds that (a) the document is not within the appropriate power; (b) a procedural requirement has not been complied with. Applications must be made promptly within six weeks from the date of this notice.

3 Analysis of schedules of changes

- 3.1** Halcrow Group Ltd carried out and prepared the Sustainability Appraisal of the Options for the Core Strategy for Hampshire's Minerals and Waste Development Framework in June 2005. This was followed in March 2006 by the Sustainability Appraisal of the Core Strategy - Final Sustainability Report.
- 3.2** The Core Strategy was then submitted to the Secretary of State on 31 May 2006, pursuant to section 20 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (the 2004 Act), where it was subject to an independent Public Examination by the Planning Inspectorate. As a result of the statutory consultation following submission during the course of the Public Examination, and as a result of the discussions at the hearing sessions, a number of minor changes to the text of the submitted Core Strategy were suggested.
- 3.3** The majority of these suggestions have been taken forward by the Inspector in his report, in his annexes A and B. Tables A and B illustrate these changes and show if they have led to any need for re-appraisal under the Integrated Sustainability Appraisal Framework. Where re-appraisal is not needed the reasons are given.

Change Ref.	Para/ Policy Ref.	Inspector's Recommendation Number	Implications for Sustainability Appraisal
1	2.2	16	New Forest National Park Authority should take on relevant recommendations of the SA process through applying the Hampshire 'core' strategy, already developed alongside SA. No action.
2	3.9	16	Plan replacement to illustrate inclusion of Wiltshire's part of National Park (as above). No action.
3	5.1	1	Plans and policies taken into account during review of plans and programmes (<i>Integrating SEA in Hampshire - Stage 2 Setting the Context and Establishing the Baseline Summary Report (2005)</i>). No action.
4	6.4	2	Strategy review required when South East Plan approved. If any significant changes result, further SA may be needed of these changes. No action.
5	10.1	3	Additional clarifying text supporting sustainability objectives. No action.
6	10.4	3	Additional clarifying text supporting sustainability objectives. No action.
7	13.1	3	Additional clarifying text, no consequences for SA. No action.
8	13.2	3	Additional text referring to other DPDs (subject to their own SA processes). No action.
9	13.4 new para	16	Additional clarifying text, no consequences for SA. No action.
10	14.0 – 14.3 new paras	3	Additional clarifying text, no consequences for SA. No action.
11	Policy S2	4	Additional clarifying text, no consequences for SA. No action.
12	16.1	5	Refers to emerging South East Plan. No action.
13	16.3	5	No changes to conclusions about provision for London's waste. No action.
14	Policy S3	5	No changes to conclusions about provision for London's waste. No action.
15	17.11	6	Additional clarifying text, no consequences for SA. No action.

Change Ref.	Para/ Policy Ref.	Inspector's Recommendation Number	Implications for Sustainability Appraisal
16	18.6	5	Any review of the strategy regarding the provision of landfilling capacity for London's Waste post 2016, should be accompanied by an SA at that time. No action.
17	Policy S6	5	Adjustment to landfill capacity not significant enough to change any SA scoring or results. No action.
18	18.11	7	Adjustment to landfill capacity not significant enough to change any SA scoring or results. No action.
19	18.13	7	Rewording, no consequences for SA. No action.
20	Policy S8	8	Rewording only (amounts of sand and gravel apportionment do not change). No action.
21	20.13 and Table above	8	These figures (worst case scenario) were previously assessed by SA, and rewording of first sentence just for clarification. No action.
22	20.14	8	Additional clarification sentence, no consequences for SA. No action.
23	20.15	8	If policy S8 is reviewed at a later date, it may need to be subject to reappraisal. No action.
24	20.16	8	Clarification text, no consequences for SA. Use of buffer zones based on the requirements of individual designated sites should be encouraged. No action.
25	20.19	9	The move towards permanent aggregate recycling facilities is encouraged. Site specific requirements must include those relevant to environmental protection (as they require large land area, open air and to be located away from residential areas - and hence may be located in areas of environmental sensitivity). To be taken into account within Hampshire Minerals Plan.
26	20.20	9	The move towards permanent aggregate recycling facilities is encouraged (particularly for incinerator ash). Site specific requirements must include those relevant to environmental protection (as they require large land area, open air and to be located away from residential areas - and hence may be located in areas of environmental sensitivity). To be taken into account within Hampshire Minerals Plan.
27	20.21	9	Rewording, no consequences for SA. No action.
28	21.2	10	Both rail and shipping provide more sustainable way of transporting aggregates and waste, the preference for rail

Change Ref.	Para/ Policy Ref.	Inspector's Recommendation Number	Implications for Sustainability Appraisal
			importation will not change the SA conclusions upon this topic and related Policy S13. No action.
29	Policy S13	10	Additional detail, no consequences for SA. No action.
30	Policy S14	11	Additional clarifying text, no consequences for SA. No action.
31	22.3	11	Additional clarifying text, no consequences for SA. No action.
32	Policy S15	11	Additional clarifying text, no consequences for SA. No action.
33	22.5	11	Additional clarifying text, no consequences for SA. No action.
34	23.2	12	Use of brownfield and employment sites to be encouraged - not impact on appraisal scoring. No action.
35	23.8	12	Additional details, no consequences for SA. No action.
36	Policy DC2	14	Additional detail, no consequences for appraisal score of Policy DC2. No action.
37	25.10	14	Additional detail serves only to protect designated sites, therefore encouraged, however the change would not warrant a rise in the appraisal scoring. No action.
38	25.12	14	Additional clarifying text, no consequences for SA. No action.
39	Policy DC5	14	Time limited waste and minerals operations could still have significant and permanent negative impacts on the environmental characteristics of the greenbelt, however, these risks should be controlled by the suite of other DC policies. No action.
40	25.24	14	Additional clarifying text, no consequences for SA. No action.
41	25.33	14	Additional detail serves only to protect designated sites, therefore encouraged, however the change would not warrant a rise in the appraisal scoring. No action.
42	25.36	14	Additional detail on cumulative impacts of past and present facilities, serves only to increase environmental protection, therefore encouraged, however the change would not warrant a rise in the appraisal scoring. No action.

Change Ref.	Para/ Policy Ref.	Inspector's Recommendation Number	Implications for Sustainability Appraisal
43	Policy DC10	14	Additional clarifying text, no consequences for SA. No action.
44	Policy DC11	14	Additional detail serves to minimise the risk of flooding and pollution events, however the change would not warrant a rise in the appraisal scoring. No action.
45	25.46	14	Additional clarifying text, no consequences for SA. No action.
46	Policy DC12	14	Rewording, no consequences for SA. No action.
47	25.50	14	Additional detail, no consequences for SA. No action.
48	Policy DC13	6	Additional detail, no consequences for SA. No action.
49	Policy DC15	8	Regarding rewording of point (d), the original appraisal score was attributed based upon there being no sites within a National Park or AONB, and no sites outside of one of those areas which adversely affects the area. New wording adds some ambiguity to this and clarification is needed as to what is and isn't acceptable. Clarification needed.
50	25.68	8	Additional clarifying text, no consequences for SA. No action.
51	25.90	14	Additional clarifying text, no consequences for SA. No action.
52	29.1	15	Additional clarifying text, no consequences for this SA. The Hampshire Minerals Plan (and associated drawings) will be subject to their own SA process. No action.
53	Appx 1	16	Procedural change, no consequences for SA. No action.
54	Appx 2 1.3	13	Changes fine given that Site Selection DPD will be subject to its own SA process. No action.
55	Appx 2 2.1	13	Additional clarifying text to be welcomed, however, consideration of Noise/Vibration should be included, unless considered implicitly under 'Sensitive human receptors', in which case this needs to be stated. Consider revising Table 1 Site Evaluation Factors.
56	Key Diagram	15	Clarifications, no consequences for SA. No action.

Table 3.1 - Table A - Implications of changes required to make the Core Strategy sound (Annex A of Inspector's Report - May 2007)

Change Ref.	Para/ Policy Ref.	Inspector's Recommendation Number	Implications for Sustainability Appraisal
A	1.2	17	Additional clarifying text, no consequences for SA. No action.
B	3.4	17	Rewording, no consequences for SA. No action.
C	3.7	17	Rewording, no consequences for SA. No action.
D	11.1 Obj (ix)	17	Additional clarifying text, no consequences for SA. No action.
E	15.5	17	Rewording, no consequences for SA as long as the sub-regional apportionment is not significantly higher. If this was the case, some re-appraisal would be required. No action at present.
F	Policy S16	17	Additional clarifying text, no consequences for SA. No action.
G	23.4	17	Additional clarifying text, no consequences for SA. No action.
H	24.4	17	Additional clarifying text, no consequences for SA. No action.
I	25.13	17	Rewording for clarification purposes, no consequences for SA. No action.
J	25.16	17	Rewording, no consequences for SA. No action.
K	25.17	17	Rewording, no consequences for SA. No action.
L	Policy DC14	17	Rewording, no consequences for SA. No action.
M	25.63	17	Rewording, no consequences for SA. No action.
N	25.76	17	Rewording, no consequences for SA. No action.
O	Appx 3	17	Clarification, no consequences for SA. No action.
P	Glossary	17	Additional definitions added, no consequences for SA. No action.

Table 3.2 - Table B - Implications of changes suggested to add clarity and consistency (Annex B of Inspector's Report - May 2007)

- 3.4** Tables A and B show that the changes made to the Strategy as a result of the Inspector's recommendations have not led to any significant changes in either the meaning or direction of any part of the Core Strategy and as such reappraisal through the Sustainability Appraisal Process is not required.
- 3.5** The Final Sustainability Report as submitted in April 2006, remains valid at the adoption stage.
- 3.6** The review of changes did, however, result in several recommendations to be taken on board during the preparation of the Hampshire Minerals Plan and Hampshire Waste Management Plan:
- Site specific environmental requirements relevant to environmental protection should be included when considering the location of potential permanent and strategic aggregate recycling facilities (within the Hampshire Minerals Plan);
 - Consideration of 'Noise / Vibration' as a separate evaluation factor in Appendix 2, Table 1, should be considered. It may be that it is included implicitly under 'Sensitive human receptors', in which case this needs to be stated;
 - Clarification of the definition of the word 'unacceptable' as now used in Policy DC15, as this may affect the appraisal scoring.

4 Integration of sustainability into the Core Strategy

4.1 This section outlines those points during the development of the Strategy where the Sustainability Appraisal process influenced decisions and outcomes.

Sustainability Appraisal Stage	Influence upon Strategy	Evidence
<i>Integrated Sustainability Appraisal (ISA): Setting the Context and Establishing the Baseline (December, 2004), and, ISA Scoping Report (March, 2005)</i>	The environmental, social and economic problems that affect Hampshire, Portsmouth and Southampton were identified from an analysis of the data contained in the Baseline Report, the plans, policies and programmes evaluation exercise, and the expertise of Hampshire County Council staff. These were then presented within the Issues and Preferred Option Report.	Section 3.1 of <i>Issues and Options Report</i> (September, 2005) Opportunities for the Strategy as a result of these identified issues are illustrated within Table 4.5 of the <i>Final Sustainability Report (March, 2006)</i> '
<i>ISA Scoping Report (March, 2005), and Table 4.7 of the Final Sustainability Report (March, 2006)</i>	Compatibility between ISA objectives and Strategy objectives. Both sets of objectives were cross-referenced at a number of stages within their development. At the Scoping stage there were a number of areas in which the Strategy objectives were antagonistic to the ISA objectives, and both sets of objectives were re-evaluated. A number of the ISA objectives were made more strategic, and in several cases combined. The Strategy objectives were also revised to reduce potential conflicts with the ISA objectives, and ensure that the Strategy was more sustainable.	Table 4.7 of the <i>Final Sustainability Report (March, 2006)</i>
<i>Interim Sustainability Report (August 2005), and, Section 5.3 of the Final Sustainability Report (March, 2006)</i>	Results of the appraisal of initial options allowed identification of preferred options in terms of Waste Management Options; Generic Waste Options; Spatial Options for Waste Management; Sand and Gravel Options; and Generic Sand and Gravel Options. The most 'sustainable option' (resulting from the appraisal) was derived using information from this appraisal and subsequent appraisal of further options post-Interim Sustainability Report.	Results of Initial Options Appraisal summarised in tabular format within Section 5.4 of the <i>Final Sustainability Report (March, 2006)</i> This led to the development of the preferred options for waste management and minerals presented within Section 5.7 of the <i>Final Sustainability Report (March, 2006)</i>
<i>Interim Sustainability Report (August 2005),</i>	Once the preferred 'sustainable options' had been derived, the Interim Sustainability Report went on to	Sections 5.5 and 5.6 of the <i>Final Sustainability Report (March, 2006)</i>

Sustainability Appraisal Stage	Influence upon Strategy	Evidence
and, Sections 5.5 and 5.6 of the <i>Final Sustainability Report (March, 2006)</i>	detail mitigation to offset, minimise or obviate the impacts of the preferred options. These were considered and taken forward within the Core Strategy itself - either in policies, supporting text or in the implementation plan.	and <i>Hampshire, Portsmouth, Southampton and New Forest National Park Minerals and Waste Core Strategy DPD (July 2007)</i> .
Section 6.3 of the <i>Final Sustainability Report (March, 2006)</i>	The Core Strategy policies were appraised against the ISA objectives within the Final Sustainability Report. This was an iterative appraisal which altered the policies as they were being developed so that by the time the Draft Strategy was submitted for consultation and Examination, the findings of the SA process had already been incorporated.	Section 6.3 of the <i>Final Sustainability Report (March, 2006)</i> and <i>Hampshire, Portsmouth, Southampton and New Forest National Park Minerals and Waste Core Strategy DPD (July 2007)</i> .
Sections 6.1, 6.2 , and Appendix 9 of the <i>Final Sustainability Report (March, 2006)</i>	The preferred options for waste and minerals as presented in the draft Core Strategy were subject to full appraisal by the ISA Framework and the results summarised so they could be considered and incorporated within the Core Strategy. Sustainability findings were provided to the four planning authorities ahead of approval of the Core Strategy. The findings were taken into account during the drafting of the Core Strategy - on balance - the Core Strategy provides a great deal of protection to the majority of Hampshire's various important social and environmental interests whilst delivering requirements set for it elsewhere.	<i>Hampshire, Portsmouth, Southampton and New Forest National Park Minerals and Waste Core Strategy DPD (July 2007)</i> .
Section 6.4 and 6.5 of the <i>Final Sustainability Report (March, 2006)</i>	Following on from the appraisal of the preferred waste and minerals options and the Core Strategy's policies, further mitigation measures were proposed. Many of these are reflected in the final submission draft of the Core Strategy, either embedded in the general approach, in policies or supporting text or in the Implementation Plan - for example, the suggested mitigation measure to promote efficiency in the movement of demolition, construction and commercial waste (e.g. back loading and logistics) is taken forward specifically in Policy S17.	<i>Hampshire, Portsmouth, Southampton and New Forest National Park Minerals and Waste Core Strategy DPD (July 2007)</i> .

Table 4.1 The influence of sustainability appraisal on the Core Strategy.

5 Consultation outcomes

5.1 It is important that the adoption statement makes clear any changes made to the Core Strategy as a result of the responses to consultation. Appendix 7 of the 'Final Sustainability Report' (March 2006) documents the responses to all ISA consultations (Scoping Report, ISA Interim Sustainability Report, 1st ISA Focus Group Workshop and 2nd ISA Focus Group Workshop). The following section tabulates all consultations undertaken and refers to the areas within the different reports where the consultation comments and resultant actions are detailed:

Consultation Stage	Influence upon Core Strategy	Evidence
Consultation upon <i>ISA Scoping Report (March 2005)</i>	A number of written comments were received from stakeholders about both the ISA objectives and the Strategy objectives.	These comments and resulting actions are laid out in Appendix 7 of the <i>Final Sustainability Report (March, 2006)</i> (particularly Tables 7A and 7B)
<i>1st Focus Group Workshop (documented within Final Sustainability Report, March 2006)</i>	Attended by representatives from the Environment Agency, Natural Resource Initiative (HCC), Transport Policy (HCC), Southampton City Council and Portsmouth City Council. Used to review the ISA Framework and to run over the results of the Initial Options Appraisal. All comments and recommendations were documented.	The comments and recommendations along with resultant actions are laid out in Appendix 7 of the <i>Final Sustainability Report (March, 2006)</i> (Table 7D)
Consultation upon <i>ISA Interim Sustainability Report (August, 2005)</i>	Only written comments received from the Environment Agency.	These comments and resulting actions are laid out in Appendix 7 of the <i>Final Sustainability Report (March, 2006)</i> (particularly Tables 7E)
<i>2nd Focus Group Workshop (documented within Final Sustainability Report, March 2006)</i>	Attended by representatives from the Environment Agency, Natural Resource Initiative (HCC), Transport Policy (HCC), Southampton City Council and Portsmouth City Council. Used to review the results of the Preferred Waste Management Option Appraisal. All comments and recommendations were documented.	The comments and recommendations along with resultant actions are laid out in Appendix 7 of the <i>Final Sustainability Report (March, 2006)</i> (Table 7F)

Consultation Stage	Influence upon Core Strategy	Evidence
<p>Consultation upon <i>Final Sustainability Report (March 2006)</i></p>	<p>Very few comments were received relating to the <i>Final Sustainability Report (March 2006)</i> the majority of comments at the stage related to the content and proposals within the Core Strategy - all consultation comments fed into the Public Examination. The main comment received was from Natural England (formerly English Nature) which took exception to the wording of policies not being wholly in-line with the Sustainability Report - this matter was considered during the Public Examination hearing sessions.</p>	<p><i>Inspector's Report (May 2007)</i></p>

Table 5.1 Consultations Undertaken and Influence upon Core Strategy

6 Conclusions

6.1 To summarise, the main conclusions of the ISA which influenced the development of the Strategy are listed below. The ISA encourages:

ISA Outcome	Core Strategy location / Comment
Approaches that reduce waste production, as far as possible and as soon as possible	Policies S1 and S2
Where waste is produced, approaches that favour re-use, recycling and recovery and treatment, preferably on-site, and in that order	Paragraph 15.1
Design of new facilities that support markets for recycled products and reduce demand for primary aggregates, and where possible improve water and energy efficiency	Policies S1 and DC1
Approaches which limit the landfilling of wastes to only unusable or un-recyclable wastes, and where landfill must be carried out, restoration should seek to add value, for example by filling mineral voids, increasing access to the countryside, improving habitats and providing reservoirs or back-up grazing for the New Forest	Policies DC12 and DC14
Where disposal and/or recovery and treatment must take place, facilities that recover as much value as possible from the waste by pre-treatment, recovery of energy and heat and the creation of secondary aggregates through recycling residues	Policies S9 and DC14
Approaches that minimise the road transport of minerals and waste by encouraging sustainable transport and self-sufficiency (including local net self-sufficiency within Hampshire), and locating sites near to sources of waste and markets for recyclables and aggregates (ideally by providing a dispersed pattern of smaller local facilities)	Policies DC6, DC13-15 and DC18
Approaches that encourage collection over 'bring' systems, and seek to optimise collection systems to reduce vehicle movements	Policy S17
Approaches that favour the co-location of minerals and waste facilities, including with other built development, to share synergistic benefits (such as use of heat and materials) and logistical benefits (such as allowing return loads)	Policy S17
Approaches that protect sensitive landscapes, habitats and other designated land or sites	DC2-11
Approaches that reduce the risk of air and water pollution and flooding	Policies DC6, DC8, DC10 and DC11

ISA Outcome	Core Strategy location / Comment
Approaches that create jobs, especially in deprived areas	All new minerals and waste development has the potential to produce jobs
Approaches that reduce fly-tipping and seek to encourage recycling through education , advice and design	Implementation plan
If landfilling of London’s waste is to be carried out, sites should be accessible via sustainable transport or failing that located as near to London as possible	This was considered at the Public Examination and it was determined that no provision would be made for landfilling some of London's waste
The use of fuels made from waste processing, in waste collection vehicles	Not appropriate for the Core Strategy
The generation of renewable energy at minerals and waste sites	Policy DC1 and adequately covered by the waste policies in the South East Plan

Table 6.1 Key ISA outcomes and their links to the Core Strategy

The Core Strategy takes on board the majority of these and, taken as a whole, the Core Strategy represents the most appropriate balance between deliverability and maximising social, economic and environmental benefits. In particular, the target to increase recycling of all waste in Hampshire to 60% by 2020, would mean an approximate doubling of recycling activity over a 15 year period, to a level equivalent to the best in Europe. The law of diminishing returns applies beyond this level. For example, increasing the recycling / composting target beyond 60% would start to threaten deliverability, in terms of cost and what is realistically achievable, and erode environmental and social benefits through increased, and possibly unacceptable, public involvement in segregation, increased transport and the need for coercive enforcement.

6.2 The main areas where the ISA outcomes have not been taken forward relate to London's waste - because it was demonstrated that there are insufficient potential sites for landfilling it. The proposed new self-sufficiency of waste management requirements within Hampshire's geographical areas which has been watered down because , given the realities of the site identification process, delivery in any way other than an aspirational one is unrealistic. And the proposal - favoured by Natural England (see above) - to 'caveat' locational development control policies subject to the 'environmental' policies, because this was implicit within the Core Strategy anyway.